

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiners for the courtesies extended during the Examiner Interview conducted on November 10, 2009. Applicants have reviewed the Interview Summary issued on November 19, 2009, and agree with its contents.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the invention. Support for the aforementioned amendments may be for example, on pages 4 and 5 of the originally filed specification. Further, claims 3, 4, 7, 10-12, 14, 15, and 17-21 have been amended for consistency with the amendments made to claim 1 and/or to address minor typographical errors. No new matter has been added by any of the aforementioned amendments.

Drawings

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the drawings.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,308,317 (“Wilkinson”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).” *See* MPEP § 2131.

Turning to the rejection, independent claim 1 requires, in part, (i) a physical channel associated with at least two logical channels (*e.g.*, first logical channel and the second logical channel), (ii) each of the logical channels is associated with a protocol stack (*e.g.*, first protocol stack and second protocol stack), (iii) each logical channel is associated with an execution environment (*e.g.*, first execution environment, second execution environment), (iv) each execution environment is configured to execute at least one of the protocol stacks; and (v) the retrievable token is configured to concurrent execute the first execution environment and the second execution environment. *See e.g.*, Specification, pages 4-5.

Turning to the rejection, Applicants continue to assert the Wilkinson fails to disclose concurrent execution of two distinct execution environments on the retrievable token. *See* Response to Office Action filed May 11, 2009. Further, Wilkinson is completely silent with respect to (i) a single physical channel being associated with at least two logical channels and (ii) a retrievable token including two concurrently execution environments, such that multiple protocol stacks may be executing concurrently on the retrievable token.

In view of the above, Wilkinson at least fails to disclose all the limitations of amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, amended independent claim 1 is patentable over Wilkinson. Dependent claims are patentable over Wilkinson for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 09669/093001).

Dated: November 19, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By /Jonathan P. Osha/
Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
909 Fannin Street, Suite 3500
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicants